This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

28
729.

J. M. 1828.

"*THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION WITH REFERENCE TO THE SALVABILITY OF THE HEATHEN.*"

IN

REPLY

TO AN

ARTICLE IN THE SIXTH NUMBER

OF THE

BRITISH CRITIC

AND QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

"It should be decidedly understood, that this work is offered as an argument for the *salvability* of *all men*, and not as a presumptuous enquiry concerning *the number of those who shall be saved.*" P. 420.

BY

EDWARD WILLIAM GRINFIELD, M.A.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,

AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

1828.

729.

LONDON:
R. GILBERT, PRINTER,
ST. JOHN'S-SQUARE.

A

REPLY,

&c.

HAVING been arraigned by a writer in "the British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review," as the most arrogant and presumptuous of modern divines, as "pretending to the capacity of looking on the splendours of the Divine Majesty without oppression or confusion," and as professing to be "able to decide infallibly what particular features of any system or doctrine were abhorrent from the dignity and beauty of that faultless pattern," (p. 335.) as "deciding in a tone of arrogant dogmatism," equal to that of Warburton, while "he has summoned to his aid such a multitude of feeble or treacherous arguments that his services have a tendency to weaken, for a time, our respect for the cause he has felt himself impelled to maintain;" (p. 352.) I think it due to my character, not merely as an author, but still more as a man, a Christian, and a Clergyman, to repel this atrocious attack on my religious principles, and to clear myself from this

imputed impiety, and to make it evident that the threat held out by my reviewer can have no terror to my conscience. " They who approach too nearly the light, which is in the dwelling-place of Omnipotence, will assuredly be struck down and overpowered by its glory." P. 335.

The spirit and temper in which this review is drawn up may be judged of from its introductory sentences. " We have in this work a notable exemplification of the injury which may sometimes be inflicted on a good cause by the exertions of an indiscreet and vehemently zealous advocate. The passionate earnestness with which this author has addressed himself to this disquisition may be sufficiently collected from the language of his preface. He there avows that 'the extreme delicacy as well as magnitude of the argument caused him frequently to lay it aside;' till, at last, the immense importance of the subject overpowered all apprehension of difficulty. 'The consequent conviction of his own duty' seems to have become like a *burning fire shut up in his bones, so that he was weary of forbearing and could stay no longer.* The impatient element has now burst forth, and finds fuel in almost every thing which crosses it in its course." P. 326.

Such is the amiable and elegant language in which this reviewer has been pleased to commence his impartial critique of a work which has been the

theme of my meditation for more than twenty years; to which all my previous studies have been directed; and which has at last been drawn up in a form which even this writer allows to be "unexceptionable." (P. 339.) "It affords by its arrangement an easy access to the scriptural authorities that bear on the question, and from its inductive method, it enables a judicious reader to separate and throw aside those attestations and those arguments on which he thinks no safe reliance can be placed." P. 353.

To shew that this work was not the result of "passionate earnestness," but of the most calm and deliberate consideration, I beg leave to reprint the two following sections from my "Connection of Natural and Revealed Theology*," a work at which I had diligently laboured for more than ten years, and to which my late treatise is but a corollary and conclusion.

PART I. SECT. 34. P. 111.

"*On the supposition of any Revelation, would it not probably be intended for the benefit of the whole human race?*

* "The Connection of Natural and Revealed Theology; being an attempt to illustrate the evidences and doctrines of Christianity by their relation to the inductive philosophy of the human mind, with notes and authorities from the most eminent ancient and modern writers. 8vo. London. 1818."

" If we admit that the Creator of the world from some extraordinary circumstances relative to our species, should interfere to save and rescue his offspring, it certainly appears most consonant to our reason and to our conceptions of the Divine attributes that he should interfere for the sake of all, rather than for the exclusive advantage of a few. Though it would, perhaps, be too much to affirm that this is essential to our notions of God's justice, (for the whole being matter of grace and favour, it could hardly be brought under the consideration of strict right,) yet it must be allowed that we could scarcely reconcile such extreme partiality to our sentiments of infinite wisdom and unlimited goodness. There is a grandeur in the attempt also, as relative to the whole world rather than to a limited number of individuals, which would and which ought to prepossess us in favour of the more comprehensive scheme of mercy. Nor upon looking abroad on the creation, should we feel disposed to think that any were devoted to certain and inevitable destruction. For though it be true, that some are placed in more favourable situations, both for virtue and happiness, than others; yet it would be impossible to shew that any individuals are entirely cut off from all means of self-improvement, and from all capability of temporal happiness. The blessings of creation and preservation extend universally to

all mankind; and though dealt out in various degrees, yet there is a principle of compensation discoverable in nature which goes far to equalize our sufferings and enjoyments. Thus even savage life has some pleasures and advantages which are peculiar to itself; so has a life of poverty and labour compared with one of ease and affluence. The acutest pain is generally accompanied with some intermissions of pleasurable ease, and there is compassion discoverable even in the circumstances of our death. These, with many observations of the like nature, might lead us to expect that if any Revelation were afforded, it would be afforded for the benefit of all, rather than of a few. And though we should not, I think, be justified in rejecting a Revelation because it did not correspond with such hopes and views, yet it would be a considerable presumption against it, so that some strong counteracting evidence would be requisite to overcome our prejudices arising from such disappointment of our natural expectations."

PART II. SECT. 32.

" Does not Christianity profess to be a Revelation designed for the benefit of the whole world?

"Although the considerations which have been already urged seem already sufficient to point out the universal nature of the Christian religion, yet

it may be proper to shew that this Dispensation is unlimited, even whilst its knowledge is but partially diffused, and its temporal benefits extended only to a small proportion of mankind. Now that the language of Christianity admits of the most wide and universal interpretation, may be seen from the following arguments: First, Its author is described as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" as "having given himself a ransom for all" as "having tasted death for all men." He is styled "the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but for those of the whole world." His death is described as being of equal extent with the universal evils arising from the Fall; and he must often have suffered, it is argued, since the foundation of the world, had not his atonement been of inestimable and unlimited importance. Secondly, The strongest proof of this universality arises out of the character of the founder of Christianity, as "the Mediator between God and man," and from the office which he will discharge over all "as the judge of quick and dead." This being a doctrine admitted by all Christians, there is no appeal from its consequences. If Jesus is to be the judge of all men, then it is in the highest degree improbable that the whole human race is not, in some degree or other, connected with Him as a Redeemer. The same conclusion will also arise from those passages of Scripture in which we are

directed "to pray for all men," to love and to honour all men. Let any candid Deist consider, whether it can be fair to object against a religion which contains such universal doctrines, as if it were limited, and confined to a few? Whether he believes in Christianity or no, as a Divine Revelation, he must admit that those doctrines are laid down in the New Testament; and that consequently, it deserves that prepossession in its favour which naturally arises out of its professing to be intended for the benefit of all mankind. Query. Has any other religion ever appeared in the world which has made the same universal professions?"

From these references, it will distinctly appear that I have not rushed "like a horse into the battle;" that I have devoted to this momentous subject all the strength and vigour of my faculties; and that so far from its being "an impatient element which has *now* burst forth:" it is the result of early and of late meditation on the Scriptures, in their connection with the principles of moral science, and that if I am wrong, as I have lived, so must I die in this irretrievable error.

My reviewer is little aware how cautiously I have approached this momentous enquiry, and what varied shapes it had assumed ere it appeared in what he allows to be its present "convenient form." Having no parochial engagements, I was enabled, during sixteen years residence at Bath, to cast and recast

these enquiries in the form of discourses from the pulpit; to try them in every aspect and attitude; to hear of their effect upon others, and gradually to combine them in one harmonious system. So far from presuming on my own powers, I at last determined to throw aside every thing like regular argumentation, and to bring forward this work in the least possible dogmatic form—as a running commentary on the history of the Old and New Testaments. I ask my reviewer, in what possible manner I could have brought forward my sentiments with less appearance of dogmatism? Is he angry that I have appealed to the word of God, rather than to the hopes and wishes of the human mind? "Which then," he asks, "we would *demand*, (and we recommend the question to the serious consideration of the author before us, and of all his readers) which is the more becoming, the more reverend, and the more pious way of conducting an enquiry, which, like the present, involves the inscrutable attributes of God? That which rushes at once to the conclusion, that the doctrine of limited redemption *must* inevitably be false, because it ascribes to the Deity proceedings inconsistent with his nature, and that an angel should not be received if he came to preach it, or that which takes a more circumspect and modest course, which first labours to establish that the scheme of universal redemption harmonises better than the opposite system, with all

our views of equity, with all the affections of our hearts and dictates of our understandings, and above all with the *general* declarations of Scripture, and then infers, that we may indulge a reasonable and *confident* hope of its truth." P. 335.

Now, if I had conducted my inquiry in the form and manner here prescribed, I ask any competent judge to say, whether it would not have assumed a far more dogmatic aspect than that in which it now appears. "He divides his work into five parts; each part being further divided into sections, and each section devoted to the consideration of some fact or text, which the author conceives to bear on the subject. At the end of each part, is a summary of the argument carried on through the preceding sections. A view of the table of contents, therefore, enables the reader, almost at a single glance, to form some notion of the resources on which the writer relies, and to survey the extent of the foundation on which he rests the fabric of his system. His method, in short, is that of induction, and at the end of his treatise he claims credit for having endeavoured to exemplify the Baconian method of investigation." P. 339.

It is after pursuing this painful, impartial, and unostentatious method of inquiry; a method which makes no appeal to human reason, but which keeps close to the text of Revelation; it is for preferring the negative praise of being a mere coaster along

the shores of the Bible, to the pride of speculation and the reputation of attempting a voyage of discovery, that I am now denounced by this reviewer as an arrogant and impious dogmatizer on the divine attributes; as "having taken on myself to pronounce with more adventurous confidence than any of my predecessors." P. 352. As "dashing through the difficulties of the subject with sweeping turbulence." 353. "As venturing to pronounce with rash confidence, what is, and what is not consistent with the attributes of the Deity," and "as leaping into the centre of these awful metaphysics, without any enquiry, whether the power or capacities of man are such as qualify him to live and move in the midst of such mysterious elements." P. 333.

I ask whether a work, which is drawn up in a form "which from its inductive method enables a judicious reader to separate and throw aside those attestations and arguments on which he thinks no safe reliance can be placed," p. 353, is, or can be deserving of this severe and unsparing reprehension? What is it that can at most be urged against the course I have pursued? That I may have possibly brought forward a few texts which, according to the opinion of some, may not seem relative to my conclusions. I have never expected or required of my reader that he should admit the force of *all* my scriptural attestations; but knowing, as I do, the vast variety of opinions on this subject, and that

the same passages which this reviewer may deem foreign or unsatisfactory, to another mind may bring light and conviction; I have preferred a large and liberal appeal to the word of God, before the spare and parsimonious sentiments of a few.

"So various is this evidence, that it comprehends almost every species of proof; it is sometimes founded on facts, sometimes on plain and natural inferences; now it is contained in a universal maxim, and now it is deduced from a particular incident. And there is this peculiar advantage attending it, that it has the weight of cumulative testimony, together with the connection and beauty of a chain of argument. It has the force of synthesis, and the accuracy of analysis. Here are numerous and diversified particulars, all conspiring to the same conclusion; but should any one of these particulars not be approved of, it may be omitted without detriment to the remainder. Upon the whole, I think it must be acknowledged, that it would be difficult to mention any doctrine of Scripture for which a larger body of multifarious congruities could be produced." P. 341.

And now, gentle reader, having entered this appeal against this violent accusation of impiety or dogmatism, with regard to the general method which I have adopted, allow me to say, that I am not ashamed of following out my premises to their conclusions, nor of avowing the determination, "that

not content with the admission that the salvability of the Heathen is possible, or with the assertion that it is on every account, in the highest degree probable, I believe it to be absolutely certain affirming, that it is as fairly and plainly deducible from Scripture, as almost any other point of Christian doctrine; and that I disdain to accept from fathers and doctors, merely as an object of *hope*, that which patriarchs and prophets and apostles have tendered me as an article of *faith*." P. 328.

My amiable reviewer, who has been long nursed in the opinions of aunts and grandmothers, and who looks up to "fathers and doctors" with such profound reverence, may well indeed condescend to accept, as an article of *hope* from them, that which I receive from Scripture as an article of *faith*. If this Theological Reviewer can persuade others to receive the doctrine of Universal Redemption on the same excellent authority, his influence must be great indeed; but I fear that in an age of free inquiry, and when aunts and grandmothers, fathers and doctors, are held in such low theological esteem, this hope will not be very strong nor very prevalent. Be this as it may, if the Bible does not contain evidence of this all-important doctrine, it is easy to see that Calvin and his followers are not very far from the truth. This, indeed, my friend is already disposed well nigh to acknowledge. "The patron of Universal Redemption *within* the

Church is compelled, as it were, to look stern and awful with one moiety of his visage, whilst he affects a mild and amiable aspect with the other." P. 329. Commend me to such an apologist for the Church of England!

If I were disposed to retort the above insinuations of impiety and irreligion, perhaps this ambiguous language might furnish me with no unfit opportunity, for it certainly savours of derision both of Calvinists and Arminians. But my friend has now taught me far better manners. "Theology, from its very nature, often involves paradoxes, and it is a region of debate which more than any other demands the constant recollection of human infirmity." P. 345.

But it is time that I should advert "to that multitude of feeble and treacherous arguments" which I am charged with having introduced into the body of my work. And first, this tender reviewer is concerned to find Mr. Grinfield asserting, that, according to the Calvinistic system, the divine government proceeds *solely* on the maxim, "Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas." P. 329. I heartily pity a writer who can thus trifle with a bit of Latin. My words are these, and it was not easy for any candid person to mistake their import. "The Calvinist may at least boast this advantage, that his principles extend over the whole world, and that, whether with relation to Pagans or Chris-

tians, the reign of arbitrary power and of infinite irresponsibility is maintained. He rests his systems solely on the edict of Omnipotence. Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas. But not so the professor of Universal Redemption." Preface, p. xi. Now, this statement, to any one who was at all conversant with the matter at issue, would have been perfectly plain and intelligible. It was my object to contrast the consistency of Calvinism on this subject, with the inconsistency of those who contend for the doctrine of Universal Redemption, as relating to the Members of the Christian Church, yet who, at the same time, deny its extension to the great majority of mankind. This was all that concerned my object, and for this purpose it was sufficient to contrast their system and our own in one single point. So far from being desirous of attacking Calvinism *in general*, as this writer represents, I have all along disclaimed this intention. "Without wishing to make any *direct* attack on the principles of Calvinists (for the rejection of the Heathen forms a component part of their system) I address my labours chiefly to those who believe, or profess to believe, that Christ has died for the sins of the whole world, and *upon their principles* I undertake to shew, from the whole history and tenor of the Bible, that the Heathen have been rendered capable of salvation through the death of Christ," &c. Preface, p. xiii. xiv.

For having made the above statement, I am gravely charged with having misrepresented the Calvinistic theory. "No well-informed Calvinist ever maintains, that in the Divine counsels the arbitrary will of the Almighty *stands in the place* of right reason." P. 329. We have then an attempt to prove, what no one ever thought of denying, that the Calvinists are *desirous* of reconciling the arbitrary will of the Deity to his attributes of mercy, and yet with a real school-boy taste, he reverts to the Latin thesis, and attempts to justify its application. "He (the Calvinist) does but put into the mouth of the Deity language which might be used (though, of course, with infinitely less authority and justice) even by a wise and benevolent human autocrat to subjects too barbarous or ignorant to comprehend enlightened and profound principles of government. He might fairly say to them, sic volo, sic jubeo—my edicts may appear harsh and unreasonable, but I have grounds for them, which it would be impossible for you to comprehend; to you, therefore, my will for the present must be the only motive for obedience, "stat pro ratione voluntas," p. 330. Alas! that I should have fallen into the hands of a pedagogue. It is plain that a latin primer or a lexicon would far better become this gentleman than disquisitions about Calvinism or Arminianism.

The next mistake which is charged on me con-

sists " in my raising an outcry against the frightful impiety of supposing that a just and gracious God will punish millions of men for their ignorance of a Redeemer, whom they had no means of knowing or receiving." P. 331. Now this, to say the least of it, is one of the poorest and most flippant quibbles that ever appeared on paper. It is the well-known dogma of Calvinists, " Nemo potest servari qui Christo per veram fidem non sit insitus *." This was the dogma which formed the first great point of dispute between the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort. But since this faith, though essential to salvation, has been utterly denied to Pagans, it is plain their condemnation will result from their want of such faith. However, let us take it on the other supposition, that their condemnation will follow, not from the want of faith, but because they were originally left under the curse of the fall, which curse has not to them been reversed. Now, if so, it is plain that no subsequent preaching can ever form the means of their conversion to Christ, for they are as incapable of believing in him as the fallen angels. Whether this would be a milder charge upon Calvinists I leave for my acute reviewer to determine.

" To assert the former, he argues, would be just about as reasonable as to affirm, that mankind pe-

* Vide Turretini Inst. Theolog. vol. i. Quest. 4, p. 11.

rished at the Deluge because they did not or could not get into the ark." P. 332. I have no hesitation in saying, that to assert the latter is *exactly* parallel to this illustration. So much for his correction on the score of Calvinism.

"Another favourite resource of the author, is a passionate appeal to the universal benevolence and perfect righteousness of the Deity, attributes which are outraged by the presumption that his dispensations of grace can possibly have a limited and partial aspect." P. 332. Who would imagine that I had drawn up my work in the method above stated, from such an accusation? It might have been supposed that I had written long disquisitions on the attributes of the Deity, whereas I have merely kept to the history and text of the Bible.

However, the light begins now to dawn upon this undigested chaos. This writer, it is plain, belongs to the school of Archbishop King, who gravely affirmed, that we know no more of the attributes of God than a blind man knows of colours. My controversy with Bishop Copleston on this subject is before the public, and there I am content to leave it. After having been honoured with such an adversary, it can hardly be expected that I should debate the point with the writer of a review.

I do not hesitate here to repeat the assertion, that if the attributes of God, as made known to us

by reason and Scripture, are so far past our understanding, that we cannot speak of them in a sound and intelligible manner, the Bible is no revelation at all to man, and that we must grope on in darkness and scepticism to the end of our course. The difficulties on our side, be it remembered, are all in favour of the *extent* of the Divine attributes,—we cannot adequately conceive of their *infinity*, whereas the difficulties of Calvinism are quite of another kind—we cannot possibly conceive of their *limitation*.

I am next charged with "an indignant and contemptuous treatment of the distinction, so long familiar to divines, between the covenanted and uncovenanted mercies of God," p. 336.—"With all deference to the many excellent and learned individuals who have sanctioned this distinction, I will venture to assert, that it has no authority whatever in Scripture," p. 347. Is this the language of contempt or indignation? However, I shall not shrink from the assertion, "that it has no foundation in Scripture;" and, as this writer can find no better name for it than "a surmise," p. 336, I presume he cannot contradict me. If "a surmise, which has the sanction of the greatest names of Theology," is to be received as Gospel, we may look in vain for any rejection of established errors.

If this writer had known any thing of the argu-

ment, he would have perceived that the whole truth of this theory, as relative to the salvability of the Heathen, depends on the rejection of this unscriptural distinction. And I beg further to add, that supposing them to be insalvable, all endeavours at their conversion must be vain and futile. If the Heathen be not contained in the first and original promise, nothing subsequent can possibly help them. You might as well go and preach to fallen spirits, as preach to men who are not salvable. But if salvable, they must be contained within the charter of redemption; the curse of the fall must have been so far revoked, as to bring them within the realms of mercy. If not, go back, my friend, to the hypothesis you have already rejected. They must be condemned on account of their want of *faith*.

This reviewer affects to be an Anti-Calvinist, and yet he contends that it is "beyond the power of argument to shew that the original promise to the woman's seed was an expression large enough to comprise the whole posterity of Eve without exception," p. 336. He might have added, or to prove that it embraces any more than a very small minority. I pity that Church from my heart which relies upon such an advocate as its defender.

"No *certain* inference can be drawn in favour of general redemption merely from the *language* of these two famous promises," p. 338, as if I had made the whole weight of the argument to

depend on a substantive or adjective. My argument was this, and it depends not so much upon words as upon *facts*.—All men were created in Adam.—All men fell in Adam.—Christ was the Creator, and Christ will be the Judge of all men.—The promise of redemption was given immediately after the fall, when only a single pair of human beings existed.—Are we to conclude that it was partial, or that it extended to all mankind ?

My reviewer recommends a great attention to words, and then confesses, that the Scriptures have very little of technical regularity or scientific precision. Well then, let us take them in their most general and popular meaning. I ask any man, whether he would not arrive at the same conclusion ?

But my critic is a lover of nature and of the picturesque, and he has cited some lines of Juvenal to answer me, and to annihilate the reasoning of Butler, that there does exist a close analogy between things in the present life and in that which is to come; and this writer gravely concludes, " that a little more attention to the character and genius which distinguish the works of God from the works of man, would have preserved all the grandeur, variety, and richness of the prospects which revelation holds out to us, and would save them from being broken and interrupted by the unsightly symmetry of mere human invention,"

p. 339. Alas! for the invention of covenanted and uncovenanted mercies.

"The author has got it into his head, that Revelation must be altogether abandoned, if the doctrine of Universal Redemption be not written there in the plainest and most legible forms; and accordingly, the whole materials which Revelation supplies, are to be moulded to the form and purpose of this theory," p. 339. How surprising, if the edifice of Redemption has been designed for the benefit of all mankind, that its foundations, superstructure, and every part of the building, should be subordinated to this grand and universal purpose! How should it be otherwise? Can this writer be ignorant that by far the most potent and plausible objections of Deism are drawn from this very source? A few years since, I saw a very curious illustration of this point. It was the intercepted letter of a poor Cornish miner, who was corresponding with his Deistical brethren in town. It contained an elaborate calculation of the supposed numbers of all who had lived and died in ignorance of the Gospel, as compared with the Jews of old and the Christians of modern times. The man took it for granted that the benefits of Christ's Redemption were limited to the members of the Christian Church. He assumed the sentiments of what I have termed *Ecclesiastical Calvinism;* and upon this single assumption he averred, it was

utterly impossible he could ever believe that the God of Christians was the God of nature. Whoever is conversant with the writings or objections of unbelievers, knows that this is the grand arsenal in which they forge their weapons; and, after the maturest consideration, I do not think that we can drive them from their conclusions in any other way than by denying their premises.

My reviewer now proceeds to the investigation of particulars, and after allowing "that it would be impossible to follow the author through all the details of his inquiry, without *inflicting* on his readers a tractate of almost equal bulk," he professes "to confine himself to the selection of such specimens of his judgment and execution as may enable his readers to form some estimate of his fitness for the task he has undertaken." P. 340.

Such was his profession at the beginning of the critique—let us now turn to his performance at its close. "We had marked down for citation various passages, exhibiting juster views of the true grounds on which we may rest our belief, or rather our hope, that the design of Redemption embraces the whole family of mankind, &c. Our limits, however, disable us from giving insertion to those passages we had intended. We trust that no injustice will be inflicted on the author by this our reluctant suppression of his happier efforts," &c. P. 353. Passing by all consideration of this con-

duct as relative to the individual, I ask any man to say, whether such would be the behaviour of one who really meant well to the doctrine of Universal Redemption? Is it at all consistent with such a belief, to expose only the errors of its advocate, and to pass by all "his happier efforts?"

He now seriously commences the attack. "It might puzzle any mortal man to divine how the confusion of tongues could be connected with the doctrine of Universal Redemption," p. 340. Indeed! as if the doctrine of Universal Redemption did not relate to all mankind, and more especially to that supernatural event by which "the nations (the Heathen) were dispersed over the face of the whole earth," Gen. xi. 5—7 *. And how does he dispose of this section? "It is sufficient to remark, that the whole of this argument depends on the assumption that, on this partial scheme, men will be punished for their ignorance of revealed truth." P. 340. The *whole* of this argument depends on no such assumption, for it is far more connected with the previous consideration, whether they are in a *salvable* condition—"whether the covenant of salvation embraces them or not." The minor hardship is swallowed up in this tremendous enquiry. The want of "*faith*" may be remedied by conversion to Christianity, the want of an interest

* See Plaifere's Appello Evangelium, p. 68.

in the covenant of the redemption *must* leave them to perish without any possibility of escape.

"The worst that can befal him, *even if unredeemed*, will be, to be dealt with after his actual sins, and *rewarded* according to his positive iniquities." P. 340. Such is the influence of Dr. Whateley's logic, when applied to the vacuum of an exhausted receiver. As if an *unredeemed* sinner could ever be treated as though he had lived in a state of trial and probation! The worst that could befal my book was to place it in the hands of such a profound dialectician.

"A remarkable instance of inconclusive reasoning occurs in Sect. xxi. p. 89, in which the salvability of the heathen is inferred from the regulation of the Jewish law, which allowed a stranger to be naturalized by circumcision. This analogy is, if any thing, decidedly unfavourable to the author's argument: for if the stranger could not enjoy the privileges of a Jew without the assumption of Judaism, how are we to conclude that a heathen can be invested with the hope and blessings of the Christian covenant without becoming a member of the Christian Church?" P. 341.

No doubt my reviewer deemed this to be a deadly blow, but, like old Priam's dart, it falls short many a rood of its intended mark. "The stranger," I have admitted, "was obliged to be circumcised ere he could partake of those peculiar advantages which

were annexed to the Mosaic economy, so also *when the Heathen are brought to a knowledge of the Gospel,* they must submit to Baptism before they can be considered members of the *Christian Church,* (p. 90.) Who does not see that the question still remains, what were the peculiar advantages of the Mosaic economy, and what are the peculiar hopes and blessings of the Christian covenant? He assumes the very point in debate, that the hope and blessings of the Christian *Church* are equivalent to the blessings of the Christian *covenant.* He would charge me with a false analogy, but I answer that he stands convicted of a plain and undisguised *petitio principii.*

" It is observed by Dr. Gray, in adverting to the history of Ruth, that 'the Holy Spirit by recording the adoption of a Gentile woman into the family from which Christ was to derive his origin, might intend to intimate the comprehensive design of the Christian dispensation,' (Gray's Key, &c. p. 166.) This remark the author allows to be judicious as far as it goes. But it is not large enough to satisfy *the cravings of his liberality.* He sees in this interesting narrative no less than a clear intimation, that though the Edomites and Moabites were among the examples of Divine judgments on sinful nations, in their temporal concerns, yet that, as individuals, they are treated in their eternal destinies like the rest of mankind." P. 113.

Whether this representation be fair may be judged of from this cautious and guarded language: "to find that a Rahab and Ruth obtained mercy *seems* to intimate that these nations were dealt with on the same terms of equity and justice as all others," p. 113. I have ventured to use stronger language at the close of the section, but that was from having subsequently met with this decided language of Scripture, "thou shalt not abhor an *Edomite*, for he is thy *brother*," &c. Deut. xxiii. 7, 8.

How does he contradict this inference? "To consider the admission of Ruth into the genealogy of the Saviour, as an emblem of the admission of the Heathen to the blessings of his dispensation, is to carry this sort of spiritualizing interpretation to the utmost legitimate extent that it will bear; but to infer from it that the heathen shall inherit eternal life, whether admitted into the Church of Christ or not, is to convert Scripture into allegory and mysticism." P. 342.

Now I will fairly avow, that I distrust all spiritualizing interpretation of Scripture if used as *arguments*, and I am not aware that I have introduced any such into my treatise: I rely upon the bare *fact*, but I have made no attempt at emblematical and allegorical interpretations.

"In the fortieth section (p. 135,) the author produces a variety of prophetic passages which

speak in very unlimited terms of the blessings of the Christian dispensation; and after admitting that these expressions have a more immediate reference to the Christian Church, he asks, 'whether they may not also admit of a more wide and comprehensive interpretation; whether they may not relate to the dispensation as well as to the revelation of a Gospel?' (p. 136.) This undoubtedly is a question which men may very properly ask of each other; and charity will prompt them to wish that the answer may be in the affirmative. But there is nothing in the expressions themselves which can extort such an answer from the adversary of Universal Redemption. We have already adverted to the danger of filling the words of Scripture with all the meaning they can possibly be made to contain. But of this danger the writer seems to be, throughout, totally insensible." P. 342.

Now the cautious manner in which this reasoning is cast, as nothing more than a modest query, ought surely to have prevented any harsh observations respecting an attempt "to *extort* an answer from the adversary of Universal Redemption." As to his reference to the prophet Joel, (chap. ii. 28.) "it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh," he ought to have remembered that the proper interpretation of those words has been given us by *inspired* authority, (Acts ii. 20,

21.) and consequently that neither he nor I could be at liberty to apply them in any other manner.

The truth is, I was well aware that all these illustrations did not *equally* relate to the argument, —some are more remote and others more proximate, but knowing how differently different minds are affected, I was unwilling to omit any thing which could throw the smallest light on this important subject. Even this impartial critic has not disdained to borrow from me the same illustration: "if pressed to enumerate the chief reason for this persuasion, we should mention the comprehensive language of the prophecies of the Old Testament," p. 356.

I do not feel it necessary to make any apology for having adopted the language of Lord Bacon, which I have no doubt, to use this reviewer's expression, is to him "as transparent as barricadoes and lustrous as ebony," p. 343.

It is not, indeed, to be wondered that the language of mortals should be contemptuously treated by this reviewer, when he has not hesitated thus briefly to dispose of our Saviour's most solemn declaration, "the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonas," Matt. xii. 41.; "And yet after all what is this, but a forcible and popular way of intimating to that generation

that their guilt was deeper than that of Nineveh; and, therefore, that their condemnation should be heavier? We *often hear it said of a worthless and unprincipled person that compared with him a robber or swindler is a respectable character; but this is never thought to imply any positive condemnation of either,*" p. 343. I much suspect whether this writer is not in his old predicament,—"looking stern and awful with one moiety of his visage, whilst he affects a mild and amiable aspect with the other."

His next objection is directed against the instance of the woman of Samaria, sect. lii. p. 174. "We know that this is the Christ, the Saviour of the world." From this declaration I had inferred, that if the faith of the Samaritans was accepted according to the circumstances in which they were placed, every merciful allowance would be made for the involuntary errors of Heathen ignorance and barbarism.

He endeavours to get rid of this inference by urging the following alternative,—"either their faith was sufficient for qualifying them to be members of the visible Church of Christ, or it was not," p. 344. But this is totally misrepresenting the whole of my argument. I never pretended to say that the faith of these Samaritans was sufficient to qualify them for any such purpose, according to our notions of the *visible Church* of Christ; but what I

affirmed, and what I still affirm, is, that it was mercifully accepted by that Redeemer who did not try them by the standard of modern orthodoxy, but who accepts "every man according to that he hath." I shall not waste another word upon this subject, but leave it to the reader's own consideration.

"Sect. lxxxiii. p. 176, relates to the miraculous cure of the nobleman's son. Of this, and all other miracles *performed for the relief of Gentiles*, it may be remarked that no safe conclusion can be drawn from them respecting their spiritual condition," p. 344. This is an excellent decision indeed, for it is directly in the teeth of several express declarations of our Saviour: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel," &c. "O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt," &c. I pity the man from my heart who would lower the benevolence of Jesus to the level of his own ecclesiastical prejudices. "That such incidents furnish 'an evidence of the mind and character of the Redeemer' may be admitted; but not such an evidence as Mr. Grinfield contends for. He affirms, that it would be altogether *incredible* to impute harshness or indifference about millions to One, who could thus compassionate individuals," (p. 177.) "Hence it must obviously be inferred, that such harshness and such indifference must be imputed to that beneficent Being by all who question the

universality of his redemption," p. 344. I cannot help the inference which arises from any fact of our Saviour's life. My argument is incontrovertible, and it is this, that without manifest absurdity we cannot impute such conduct to the Almighty Saviour of the world, *ergo*, &c.

As for the manner in which this critic attempts to elude the force of my argument it is nothing to the purpose. The destruction of millions and tens of millions by storms and earthquakes has no relation to the inevitable destruction of a single soul in hell. This world is a state of trial, and as such all temporal losses and accidents can be set right hereafter, but if a single being has come into the world without the means of salvation, or in other words, if a single being perishes not by his own fault, but by the will and intention of the Deity, there is an end to the Divine beneficence. In all such cases, the indirect mode of demonstration seems perfectly satisfactory.

" Sect. lv. p. 180. In reference to the precept that we are to ' love our enemies,' the author remarks, ' certain it is, that if we could believe that the great body of mankind were excluded from the capability of salvation, we should be deprived of every motive to love them, and they would then stand nearly in the same relation to us as the fallen angels.' ' No man is called to exercise greater benevolence than the Deity whom he adores. If then

the Deity be partial and austere, reaping where he hath not sown, and gathering where he hath not strawed, his worshippers will naturally indulge the same emotions,' (p. 180.) Here then again we find it plainly implied, that a partial redemption would necessarily constitute the Deity, austere, malevolent, and iniquitous; and we have, besides, the scarcely less reprehensible notion that created and fallible beings would be authorized to imitate the Almighty in the manifestations of his mysterious severity. It is difficult to figure to ourselves a more pernicious or presumptuous imagination." P. 345.

To this I reply in the language of Barrow, "We are commanded to pray, intercede, and give thanks indifferently for all men, even for heathens and persecutors, as for the objects of God's benevolent affections, whom he would have to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; expressing our charity in conformity to the unconfined goodness of God. Very good reason, argues St. Chrysostom, there is why we should pray for all men, for if God doth will the salvation of all men, we, in imitation of him, should do the same." Serm. lxxi. Sect. 6.—What pernicious and presumptuous imaginations!

"And then," he adds, "supposing the heathen, *so long as they remain unconverted*, to be incapable of salvation, is there no difference between them and the apostate spirits? Are they to be placed

like devils beyond the pale of all human charities, and to be denied all kindly and benevolent offices? Is it to be forgotten that a heathen *may be* reclaimed, and thus, at least, may become an heir of salvation, but that the fallen angels are incurably wicked and malicious? If it would be allowable to treat an insalvable heathen as an abomination, so long as he should remain a heathen, in what light are we now to regard a wicked man so long as he continues impenitent?" P. 345.

It would be difficult to select a more precious specimen of pure jargon than this. By the salvability of the heathen, I have all along meant nothing more than that they were admitted, by virtue of the redemption of Christ, to the *capability* of being saved, and that whilst their ignorance of Christianity was involuntary, they were not expected to possess any Christian faith, but would be mercifully dealt with according to their individual deserts. But what jargon is this—"if it would be allowable to treat an *insalvable* heathen as an abomination, so long as he should remain a heathen, in what light are we to regard a wicked man, so long as he continues impenitent." P. 345. But who ever regards a wicked Christian as *insalvable?* Go back, my friend, to your old rejected hypothesis. It is far more merciful (though equally absurd) to condemn the heathen for *want of Christian faith*, than to leave them out of the covenant and charter of Christ's re-

demption; because, in the one case, the qualification may be supplied by conversion, but in the other they are rendered utterly incapable of the title.

Section lxii. p. 192. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27. "From these words the author conceives it to follow, 'by plain and incontrovertible inference,' that Christ now stands towards the heathen in the same relation, as though they had been personally acquainted with his mediatorial character. He reasons thus: Since Christ is to judge all men, he must bear a previous relation to all; he could bear no previous relation to men otherwise than as their Saviour and Redeemer, therefore Christ is the Saviour and Redeemer of all men." P. 346.

If this reasoning be not conclusive, I cannot assist my reviewer by explaining it; he seems to want some power of deduction which is necessary to the simplest process of argumentation. Need I remind him, that the whole reasoning of St. Paul respecting the priesthood of Christ, "it *became* us to have such an high priest," is dependent on the same principle? But perhaps I ought to have taken blame to myself that I did not improve this argument by a reference to Christ as "the life and resurrection" of all men. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And

now, if the *heathen* are to be raised again, as well as Christians, in virtue of Christ's resurrection, I put it to any one to say, whether he must not bear to them a federal relationship, and whether this relationship be not that of a *Redeemer* as well as of a *Judge*.

In sect. lxiv. p. 207, it is asked, with reference to Matt. xviii. 12. "If it be the will of our heavenly Father that not one of these little ones should perish, can we suppose it possible that he has created millions of adults, without any capability of working out their own salvation?"

"This appeal to the compassionate nature of the Deity, we have before had repeated occasions to expose as worthless in the way of argument, as an unfair, a very unfair resource of controversy." P. 347. To this it is easy to reply, that when the will of our heavenly Father has been revealed and declared by his Son, we cannot appeal to any higher evidence. It is, in short, the method which our Saviour and his Apostles have frequently adopted. "If God so clothe the grass of the field," &c.

It is quite unnecessary to follow this writer into his prolix dissertation about the term "will" as applied to God. Such expressions are perfectly intelligible to all but the followers of Archbishop King, and the pupils of the new Academy. Let him save himself all further trouble by recollecting his own admission, "that the language of Scripture

is throughout popular, and that it has little or no technical regularity or scientific precision." P. 338.

In sect. lv. p. 227. he objects to the introduction of Christ's praying for his murderers, as having no connection with the question of the salvability of the Gentiles, p. 348. If I am to be blamed for this illustration, let Barrow come in for the principal share. "His prayer for them implies the possibility of their forgiveness." "The case of the Roman centurion and of the repentant thief, I have already left, without comment, to the consideration of my readers," p. 227, and there I am content still to leave them.

"It is asked in page 228, how any partial benefits can reasonably be imputed to him who exclaimed, 'And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me?' John xii. 32. This passage, however, will be found to be but a treacherous auxiliary to the cause of universal redemption. If it proves any thing respecting the extent of redemption, it may be used to prove that none can ultimately perish." P. 347.

This is making short work of an argument. I have never confounded the question of the salvability either of heathens or Christians with that of their final salvation. It is sufficient that all men are *drawn*, by the atonement of Christ, into the capability of being saved, and into connection with him as their federal head and Redeemer; but to

assert that because he is the Saviour of all men in this sense, he will be the Saviour of all hereafter, this it never came into my thoughts to imagine.

"In sect. lxxiii. p. 236, it is said, 'Admit the doctrine of irrespective election and reprobation, as it regards ages and nations, and you cannot disprove it as relating to individuals.' A more egregious inconsequence cannot well be imagined." P. 349. If so, why does not my reviewer undertake the point? The late Mr. Scott, who was as profound a Calvinist as any of his age, in commenting on the articles of Dort, was of the same opinion. "The election of nations is really as opposite to the anti-Calvinist's ideas of justice, as the election of individuals." P. 226. I believe he was perfectly correct in this assertion,—"fas est ab hoste, &c." "That either of these doctrines necessarily involves the other, is more than any human being can be entitled to pronounce." P. 349. It is a bad sign of any cause, when such a continual appeal is made to our ignorance. "Perhaps the lxxviith section," he continues, "furnishes as remarkable a specimen as any in the book, of the author's resolution to extort testimony from the Scriptures, as it were by the rack." In this section I have endeavoured to shew, from Rom. viii. 18—22, that as the whole creation was awaiting the manifestation of the Son of God, and was groaning and travailing in pain together, even until the coming of Christ, we had

sufficient reason to apply these expressions of the Apostle in the most universal and comprehensive sense, as relative to the whole body of mankind. "Does it not *seem probable* that the expressions of the Apostle are to be taken in their utmost latitude, and if so, do they not imply that all the heathen have been brought into a *salvable* condition, through the mission of Jesus Christ?" P. 289. It is for putting this query in such a moderate and guarded manner, that I am thus rebuked by this kind animadverter. "Who would ever think of *confidently* deriving, merely from the confusion and wretchedness which are prevalent in the world, any inference whatever?" P. 350.

Sect. xciv. p. 302. "The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge that if one died for *all*," &c. "The beauty and force of this reasoning, says Mr. Grinfield, would be altogether lost, if it could be shewn that the great majority of mankind were not included in its meaning. This is by no means obvious. The love of Christ would be a constraining motive with sincere Christians, even on the exclusive system; unless it can be shown that our attachment to a benefactor must be weakened or destroyed by the knowledge or belief that his bounty is chiefly directed towards ourselves." P. 350. Let Barrow reply,—

"No man should be puffed up with conceit, that God hath a singular regard to him. For all such

conceits are groundless and vain; in them men do miserably delude themselves. No man should be discouraged for his condition or fortune; since in allotting it to him God had no disfavour nor did intend him ill. God hath no less regard to him than to persons of the most high, wealthy, prosperos state." Serm. LXX.

My reader will observe, that the critic has taken no notice of the extent of the terms, on which this observation was founded.—"If one died for *all*, then *all* were dead," &c. This was prudent.

"The reasoning in sect. xcix. p. 313, is wholly inconclusive. How does it follow from the proper divinity of Christ, that the redemption which he has effected must be necessarily universal, that because he is the maker of all things (he might have said of all *men*) he must be the Saviour of all men?" P. 350. I blush to copy such strange questions. I had supposed that the perfections of the Deity were to be ascribed to my Saviour; that as God "was no respecter of persons," so the same assertion might be predicated of the Son of God. But I will not debate this subject with a man who is incapable of any large and comprehensive reasoning.

"In sect. c. p. 315, the author affirms that the partial scheme tends to rob the Redeemer of a great part of his glory." P. 350. Thousands of divines have said this before me. I am but repeating what every anti-Calvinist writer has re-

peatedly affirmed, and what we must continue to affirm, so long as we make any deductions at all.

"The words quoted in sect. cii. p. 319, 'Those that are without, God will judge,' *though employed by the Apostle for a different purpose*, are calculated to give just the proper direction to our thoughts on this mysterious question." P. 351. Here is a fine *ipse dixit; the words are employed by the Apostle for a different purpose;* and yet he draws from them an inference against the salvability of the heathen. Who now is acting the logician? Is not this summoning to your aid "feeble and treacherous arguments?"

"The text 1 Tim. iv. 10, quoted in sect. civ. p. 323, is undoubtedly a potent authority in favour of Universal Redemption: and yet, powerful as it is, the author's vindication of it is almost calculated to weaken it and render it suspected. He observes, that the word σωτὴρ cannot here be taken to signify a Preserver, in the ordinary sense of the word, for that preservation of men in this life would be a curse if it were to end in destruction hereafter! a position which would be sufficient to prove, that God cannot justly be entitled the Preserver of all or any portion of mankind, unless it can be shewn that the impenitently wicked shall be annihilated at their death!" P. 351.

My argument on this subject is precisely the same as Dr. Barrow has repeatedly urged in his four noble

discourses on this text. I appeal to his authority from all such absurd misrepresentations, and the same authority will bear me out in his animadversion on Heb. ii. 9, "that he might taste of death for every man." "Subjection and redemption are here one ground, so are they implied to the same extent. As every one must call Christ Lord, so may he call him Saviour. Therefore his Lord became his Saviour. And since Christ has got an authority over all men, a property in every man; since he has undertaken to govern and protect the world, he *questionless*, as a prince of incomparable benignity and clemency, doth seriously intend and desire the best welfare of all his people. It surely cannot be a small benefit to the community of men, that they are his subjects, the objects of his princely care and of his mercy. 'He taketh care of all, which doth become him, and he is Lord of all, for that he is indifferently the Saviour of all,' saith Clement of Alexandria." Barrow, serm. lxxi. What a relief to enjoy the noble speculations of Barrow, after the feeble and narrow sophistries of this most incompetent censor.

"In sect. cv. p. 327, it is asserted that to suppose Christ's redemption to be partial is to deny the divinity of his atonement. Let us then for a moment imagine that God *chose* to redeem only a portion of mankind. Is the author prepared to assert that this could have been accomplished by a

less costly ransom? The blood of the incarnate Son is precious enough to redeem innumerable millions. But who can venture to assert that less than that blood would have been sufficient to redeem one?" P. 351.

I have never made any such assertion. But arguing as I have done all along, not with Calvinists, but with *those who profess to admit the doctrine of universal redemption as relative to the members of the Church,* I cannot allow any such supposition as this—" if God chose," &c.

Sect. clx. p. 335. Those to be redeemed are " out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;" from this I have inferred, that unless all tongues, &c. were in the capacity of being saved, I did not see how the promise could be accomplished. He replies, that notwithstanding the rejection of all the Heathen, an *overpowering majority* might still remain on the other side! I am at a loss to know on what data he is calculating. For this could only be accomplished by supposing that we are living in the earliest infancy of the world, and that millions of years should intervene before the consummation of all things. If so, he stands opposed to all the commentators on prophecy.

And thus have we arrived at the close of the objections which have been brought against my work. Whether I have sufficiently replied to them must be left for the public to decide; but it may

surprise many to be informed, that in nearly all those Sections which relate to the New Testament I am countenanced by the *direct* authority of Barrow. The title of his celebrated discourses on this subject is "The Doctrine of Universal Redemption asserted and maintained," and I appeal to these discourses without any fear of contradiction, that they do assert and maintain this doctrine in reference to the Heathen with equal positiveness and dogmatism to any thing which is advanced in my treatise.

What, then, is the head and front of my offence? That I have ventured, after twenty years' meditation, to bring forward a regular and digested treatise on the doctrine of Christ's redemption, in reference to the salvability of the millions to whom a knowledge of the Gospel has not been imparted;—that I have brought the whole history and doctrine of the Scriptures into connection with this argument;—that I have carefully guarded my inferences against all abuse as relating to our obligations of spreading the revelation wherever we are aided by Providence;—and that I have associated my conclusions with the most important controversies against the Calvinist, Unitarian, and Deist, by shewing, that when the salvability of the Heathen is identified with the received doctrines of orthodoxy, we shall stand on such a vantage ground as must lead to a universal triumph.

What, on the other hand, is the attempt of my

assailant? Whilst he professes himself to be anti-Calvinistic, he gives up every point in dispute to the Calvinist;—he will not allow that as all men fell in Adam, so all must have been redeemed by Christ;—that if Christ be the Creator, and the Resurrection, and the Judge of all men, he must necessarily be the Redeemer of all;—that if all men are living in a state of trial and probation, they must necessarily all be in a salvable condition;—that the very attempt to convert the Heathen, on *anti-Calvinistic principles*, pre-supposes *some* of them to be in this state;—that such plain declarations as these, "God is no respecter of persons," "he willeth not the death of a sinner," "he will reward every man according to what he hath," "he is the Saviour of all men," &c. bind up this conclusion not only with the doctrine, but with the morality of the whole inspired volume.

But I am told that I ought not to have asserted that as an article of faith which can at most be shewn only to be a matter of hope and opinion. If this be the case, why is the child instructed to repeat in the Catechism that "Christ hath redeemed me and *all* mankind?" Why do we assert in our sacramental service, that "Christ has made a full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the *whole world?*" I will not yield one jot to this reviewer or to any other man in my attachment to the Church of which

I am an unworthy minister. I believe the Liturgy of that Church to be built on the assumption, that the scheme of Christ's redemption is designed for the benefit of the whole human race. I have merely followed out the doctrines of my Church to their fair and legitimate conclusion, and have shewn, that unless these doctrines be maintained in all their fullness and extent in relation to the Heathen, they cannot be consistently maintained as relative to professing Christians.

Does this writer suppose that the dogmatism of Calvinists can ever be put down by the scepticism and neutrality which he recommends? Does he think that the objections of Deism can ever be refuted by arguments which are drawn merely from our supposed ignorance? Does he think that Unitarians are to be convinced of the divinity of Christ whilst he leaves it a matter of doubt whether Christ has died for the benefit of all? What would become of the whole reasoning of Bishop Butler's Analogy, if we are not allowed to believe in the universality of the Christian dispensation? Of all the schemes which have ever been proposed, that of ecclesiastical Calvinism in a Protestant Church is the most odious, by which I mean the profession of confining the mercies of God in Christ to the members of the Church, to the exclusion of the great body of mankind; and of all the schemes of scepticism which have ever been brought forward under

the mask of Christian humility, the most dangerous is that of pretending, that we have a revelation from Heaven which has not determined whether the great majority of mankind have any trial or probation afforded them; which affirms that we know nothing about the attributes of God; that the plainest declarations of Scripture are not sufficiently plain to inform us; that the goodness, justice, and mercy of God are not of the same kind as the goodness, justice, and mercy of man; in a word, that we know less of the divine attributes, though embodied in the example and person of Christ, though explained in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, than Plato or Tully, who deduced them from the speculations of philosophy.

It was in opposition to this new school of Christian Academics, that I stood forward on a former occasion to warn the Church of England and the public of the insidious dangers which lurk in their writings. Under the specious pretence of avoiding dogmatism and of opposing presumption, they are, in fact, taking from us all the firmness and solidity of those principles, on which the evidence of natural as well as of revealed theology must ultimately depend. If we may not appeal to the love and mercy and justice of God in the same plain and intelligible manner as our predecessors, there is an end to our controversy with the advocates of arbitrary decrees. If the plain words of Scripture are not ad-

mitted to contain a plain and intelligible meaning, I know not how the cause of sound doctrine is to be maintained against the Unitarian, nor even how the sanctity of the Bible is to be advocated against the avowed unbeliever. Let us not be deceived by unmeaning professions of Christian humility, nor by equally unmeaning appeals to the ignorance and short-sightedness of man. We undertake to decide these questions on the ground and on the authority of revelation, not by the mere light of the human understanding. The point at issue is to be determined by an appeal to the Scriptures, and it is to this tribunal that I have solely directed my appeal. But I cannot allow that it is possible the Scriptures should not have decided the point either one way or the other. The Calvinist boldly affirms the Heathen are excluded from the benefits of Christ's redemption; I as boldly affirm they are included; then comes the Critic and says the matter is uncertain. Now, I say, this is incredible; for the whole spirit and tenor and history of revelation must have decided either for the partial or the universal scheme. As well might you affirm that a mansion may be at once large and small; that it may be fitted to contain few or many. No. It is a question which must be decided either on one side or the other. As for the *doubters* on this subject they are good for nothing; and we may apply to them the words of

Christ: "he who is not for us is against us; he who gathereth not with us, scattereth."

The best, the ablest divines of our Church, I affirm, have been equally positive and dogmatic with myself on this subject, and that it never entered into the minds of Barrow or Taylor, of Tillotson, Clarke, Sherlock, or Butler, to entertain any doubts whether the scheme of Christ's redemption relates to all mankind. Even the most eminent of what are termed "the high Church divines" have virtually come to the same conclusion, nor have they been more cautious in their manner of expressing it. "It is to be observed," says the present learned Bishop of Durham, "that although a very great proportion of mankind, in the times preceding the Christian dispensation, were comparatively ignorant of revealed religion, and of the great work of redemption then carrying on, yet will it by no means follow, that they would have no participation in its benefits. The Scripture solves this difficulty by declaring Jesus Christ to have been 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;' slain, that is, in the Divine purpose, for the redemption of all mankind. Here the *retrospective* effects of this great sacrifice appear to be clearly pointed out. It may be presumed, therefore, that for the sake of Christ, and through his all-prevailing merits, many who, in the times of heathen ignorance, strove

to live suitably to that imperfect degree of knowledge which they possessed, will finally be accepted of God. Every notion of the Divine goodness or justice which we can form, leads us to believe, that, whether the means of grace and salvation, be more or less clearly revealed, he will acquit or condemn mankind according to their use or abuse of the degree of information vouchsafed to them; so that they who, under the Gospel Dispensation, have gathered much, will have nothing over, and they who, under the preceding dispensation, gather little, will lack nothing of their final reward." *Bp. Van Mildert's Boyle Lectures,* vol. ii. p. 296. *Third Edit.*

" I have always concluded," says the late Archdeacon of Sarum, " from the consideration that the benefits of Christ's death are in some sense co-extensive with the effects of Adam's fall, (Rom. v. 18.) that numbers will be saved through Christ that never heard of his name, &c. It is not said that virtuous Heathen will stand upon the same footing as Christians, nor is it our business to determine what may be lost in consequence of their not having heard the Gospel; but the Apostle, 1 Cor. v. 12, tells us they will be judged, and if so, my conclusion is, that through the merits of Christ, they will receive a reward proportionate to the dispensation under which they lived." *Daubeny's Appendix to the Guide to the Church,* p. 282, 283.

It gives me peculiar pleasure to adduce this passage from the writings of one who expressed himself but shortly before his death so much gratified with my work on the salvability of the Heathen. "I have always been of your opinion," he said to me; "I never could bear the sentiments of Beveridge on this subject; and you have placed many passages of Scripture in such a light as I had not previously considered them." The reader, I trust, will excuse my referring to such an authority, now that I am charged with arrogance and profaneness by this anonymous opponent, especially as I might be supposed to have glanced at Mr. Daubeny's writings, in my observations on the distinction of covenanted and uncovenanted mercies, and in some other parts of my work. To confess the truth, I was not aware of this passage in "The Guide," till it was pointed out by a mutual friend.

The circumstances of the times may have turned my attention perhaps more forcibly to this subject, than if I had lived in the days of Barrow or Sherlock. When they argued on behalf of the salvability of the Heathen, they were reasoning only against the theoretical errors of theological systems, but these are times when the contrary opinions are openly avowed, and brought forward as the principal motives for missionary exertion. At the last meeting of the Church Missionary Society at Bath, a speaker is represented as saying, that he viewed

the millions of unconverted Heathen as so many individuals shut up in a house which is in flames, or as passengers in a vessel perishing at sea; and such are the pictures which are continually held out to incite missionary attempts. But if such sentiments are to be allowed as fair deductions from the Scriptures, how can the Divine attributes be consistently maintained on the principles of Christianity? If these are to pass as doctrines of the Bible, may not the horrible misrepresentations of Carlile and Taylor at length become current with many as containing some admixture of truth?

But are errors like these to be combated by the "ifs" and "doubts" of this modern school of Christian Academics? Is it by professing "we know no more of the attributes of the Deity than a blind man knows of colours," that we can successfully confront the dogmatic assertions of Calvinists? Born and baptized amongst a class of Christians, who of all others have been the most distinguished for their missionary labours, I will yield to no man in the ardent desire to behold the progress of Christianity accelerated by every practical and judicious measure. But I will not lend myself to any of the delusions which have gone forth on this subject. I fearlessly maintain, that, whilst *Calvinists* can assist in missionary labours only on the principle that they are rescuing certain elect individuals amongst the Heathen

(these individuals being previously *salvable*) by supplying them with the channel of *faith*; that we, as *Anti-Calvinists*, must either admit their universal salvability, or be driven to the absurd and impious conclusion, that we can supply the want of an original faith in Christ's redemption by admitting them to a membership with the Christian Church.

In whatever light this controversy is surveyed, it is incomparably the most interesting and important of any which has ever been debated; it involves all the principles of natural and of revealed theology, and as such, I invoke the attention of all professing Christians, nay, of unbelievers, to its consideration. To my opponent this may possibly sound like very strange language, and so it must sound to every one who regards Theological controversy as the source of professional advancement, and of party influence; but to all others the question, whether the whole body of mankind, or only a small minority, have been placed in a state of trial and probation, and whether Christ has died for all or only for a few, is a question, I say, which leaves the Popish and all other controversies at an immeasurable distance. To have been stigmatized as insolent, arrogant, and profane, for awakening this inquiry, I deem the highest honour of my life —it is an accusation which I shall always remember with triumph. But I trust that men of talents,

of large and liberal minds, will give it their serious attention—whether as an associate or antagonist, I should be delighted to behold some individual of vigorous intellect stepping forward to illuminate this inquiry.

Optat aprum aut fulvum descendere monte leonem.

For myself, I can conscientiously affirm, that I have made truth without any dowry the object of my love and labours; and it is some confirmation of this assertion, that I have been abused and vilified by men of the most opposite opinions. Whilst Mr. Brougham and his friends have derided me as the advocate of tory principles *, and as the patron of every ancient abuse and exploded error, here I am denounced as arrogant and contemptuous, and as insatiable "in the cravings of my liberality."

Unfit for all parties, how droll is my story,
Amongst tories a whig, amongst whigs I'm a tory.

But I am satisfied,—such has been the lot of some of the wisest and best of men; and, whether alive or dead, I wish to be remembered only as a man of honest, independent, and uncompromising integrity.

Secta fuit, servare modum finemque tenere,
Nec sibi, sed toti genitum se credere mundo.

* See Edinburgh Review, vol. xlii. p. 206—223.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the above Reply to the Theological Quarterly was placed in the hands of the printer, I have found that my work has been honoured with a brief notice in the last Number of the Eclectic Review. There also I am charged with a gross ignorance and misconstruction of the Calvinistic system, but for a reason which will probably surprise my former antagonist not less than myself. I had assumed that the universal rejection of the Heathen formed an integral and essential part of the Genevan hypothesis; but it seems that *modern* Calvinism is not to be charged with this dogma, and that the "compunctious visitations" of Cowper and Newton are henceforth to be regarded as an authentic appendix to the doctrine of personal election!

My charge against Calvinism, on the subject of the non-salvability of the Heathen, was founded on an acquaintance with the incomparable Institutes of Calvin, on the statements of Turretine and

Ridgley, of Gill, and of President Edwards *. In the writings of these eminent and learned Predestinarians this conclusion is openly avowed, nor do I find that the smallest doubts were expressed concerning it at the Synod of Dort. It remains now to be seen, whether the creed of Dr. Wardlaw and

* It is not my wish, as I have already intimated, p. 458, to make any collection of the "hard sayings" against the Heathens: but as their rejection is now denied to form a part of the Calvinistic system, it is necessary that I should point out some distinct references in justification of my statement. For this purpose let the reader consult Calvini Institut. lib. 2, cap. xi. sect. xi.—Turretini Loc. Prim. Quæst. iv.—Gill's Body of Divinity, book vi. chap 3 and 4.—Ursini Doct. Christ. Compend. Pars prim. de hominis miseria, p. 127, edit. Lond. 1586. Prideaux, Fascic. Controvers. Quæst. vii. "Qui non crediderit, condemnabitur; et sine fide impossibile est placere Deo; unde optima Ethnicorum opera sunt tantum, secundum Augustinum, *splendida peccata.*" p. 163, *edit. Oxon.* 1649. Amongst the errors denounced by the Synod of Dort, was that of those "who teach that men can so rightly use common grace, which in them is the light of nature, and the gifts remaining after the fall, that by this good use they may obtain greater grace, evangelical or saving, and gradually may obtain salvation itself." *Scott's Translation*, p. 145. In Ridgley's Body of Divinity, Vol. i. p. 434, &c. he will find the universal rejection of the Heathen assserted in all its horrors. I am not aware that any such "compunctious visitations" are to be met with in the older and more authorized systems of Calvinistic Theology; and it was for expressing hopes of the final state of the more virtuous Heathen, that Zuinglius has been well nigh regarded as a heretic. *See Milner's Church History*, vol. v. chap. 16. Consult also Vossii Theses Theolog. p. 383.—403. Edit. 1658.

the Eclectic Reviewer will pass current with their brethren on this subject. " We lay it down, without hesitation, as the doctrine of Scripture, as it is also the evident dictate of reason, that responsibility is according to privilege; that the punishment of offences by the judgment of a righteous God will be exactly proportioned to the extent in which the means have been enjoyed of the knowledge both of duty and of the obligations to perform it." P. 375.

Now, if Dr. Wardlaw in this and similar passages intends to assert, that no one individual amongst the Heathen will be punished on account of *original* sin, but merely for the *actual* sins which he has committed, and that he will be treated with all the lenity and mercy which can be shewn him under the system of redemption, I have no hesitation in saying that our opinions exactly agree. But if so, how is this reconcilable to the Assembly's Catechism? It is plain, that the shoe pinches exactly where I had supposed; and an attempt is accordingly made to extend the doctrine of Personal Election to individuals amongst the unconverted Heathen. This, I suppose, is *modern* Calvinism. But what it gains in amiability it loses in compactness and solidity; and if once such chinks are opened, the system of Calvin must fall into necessary decomposition.

That the great body of the Calvinists *do* believe

in the necessary and inevitable destruction of the unconverted Heathen is matter of plain and public notoriety, and it is openly avowed at almost every Missionary meeting. And if I were a Calvinist, I would avow the same belief, for I should consider it a necessary corollary of my principles.

There is one point, however, on which I may call for a full and satisfactory counter-statement from this reviewer. He charges me with having confounded "the universality of the Christian dispensation with its universal efficiency." "The author professes to treat of the salvability of the Heathen, but he overlooks the infinite difference between salvability and salvation," p. 374.

Now unless this reviewer is content to stand convicted of open falsehood and detraction, he will either make good or withdraw this accusation. In what part of my work have I fallen into this monstrous error? In the 'Preliminary Observations' I disavow any connection with the dreams of universal restoration. When all men shall stand around the judgment-seat of Christ, the Heathen as well as others, will receive their allotted portions of *punishment* or reward, p. 14. If the reviewer consults the note, (p. 430,) he will find that I have disclaimed all such arrogant enquiries respecting the *final state* of individuals whether amongst Christians or Heathens: "As to the method of disputing whether Socrates or Cicero, &c. were saved

individually, we regard it as nothing better than the Calvinistic doctrine of personal election applied to Heathen philosophers; and as we utterly disapprove of the presumptuous method, when applied to *believers*, we cannot be supposed to admire it with regard to *others*. They, the Heathen, are universally salvable, i. e. in a condition in which they *may* be saved, in consequence of the covenant of God in Christ; but, as *individuals*, they will be judged according to their behaviour, as compared with their means of knowledge," p. 274, *et passim*.

Again, I call on this reviewer, if he has a spark of Christian charity, or any pretension to the title of an honest assailant, to make me the only reparation in his power by contradicting this foul and monstrous misrepresentation. In their *salvability*, I have included nothing beyond the state in which they *now* are, considered as a state of trial. "*The question is, not as to the number of the Heathen who shall be saved, but as to their universal capability of salvation through the Redemption of Christ.*" P. 2.

FINIS.

Printed by R. GILBERT, St. John's Square, London.